

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT (S. 2549) FOR FY2001  
ADD-ONS, INCREASES AND EARMARKS—Continued

	Dollars (in mil- lions)
Infrasound Detection Basic Research .....	1.5
Program Increase .....	15
Chemical Agent Detection-Optical Computing .....	2
Thin film Technology .....	3
Wide Band Gap .....	2
Bio-defense Research .....	2.1
Hybrid Sensor Suite .....	8
High Definition Systems .....	7
Three-Dimensional Structure Research .....	3
Chem-Bio Detectors .....	5
Blast Mitigation Testing .....	3
Facial Recognition Access Control Technology .....	2
Magdalena Ridge Observatory .....	9
Wide Band Gap .....	10
Excalibur .....	3
Atmospheric Interceptor Technology .....	15
Chem-Bio Individual Sampler .....	2.7
Consequence Management Information System .....	6.4
Chem-Bio Advanced Materials Research .....	3.5
Small Unit Bio Detector .....	8.5
Complex System Design .....	5
Competitive Sustainment Initiative .....	8
WMD simulation Capability .....	5
HAARP .....	5
Integrated Data Environment (IDE) .....	2
Advanced Optical Data and Sensor Fusion .....	3
Advanced Research Center .....	6.5
KE-ASAT .....	20
WMD Response System .....	1.6
Information Operations Technology Center Alliance .....	5
Trust Rubix .....	1.8
Cyber Attack Sensing and Warning .....	20
Virtual Worlds Initiative .....	2
Smart Maps .....	5
NIMA Viewer .....	5
JCOATS-IO .....	5
Information Assurance Testbed .....	5
Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher .....	5.6
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense, RDT & E:	
Central T & E Investment Development (CTEIP) Program	
Increase .....	20
Reality Fire-Fighting Training .....	1.5
TITLE III OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE	
Army O&M:	
Range Upgrade .....	50
Battlefield Mobility Enhancement System .....	10
Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness .....	1.5
Navy O&M:	
Navy Call Center—Cutler, Maine .....	3
Operational Meteorology and Oceanography .....	7
Nulka Training .....	4.3
Range Upgrades .....	25
MTAPP .....	2
Information Technology Center—New Orleans, LA .....	5
Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site—Suffolk, VA .....	0.9
USMC O&M (none)	
USAF O&M (none)	
O&M Defense Wide:	
JCS Mobility Enhancements .....	50
Defense Acquisition University .....	2
DLA MOCAS Enhancements .....	1.2
Joint Spectrum Center Data Base Upgrade .....	25
Legacy Project, Nautical Historical Project—Lake Champlain, NY .....	6.1
Information Security Scholarship Program .....	20
Command Information Superiority Architecture .....	2
Information Protection Research Institute .....	20
Impact Aid .....	20
MISCELLANEOUS	
Defense Health Program .....	98
Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance .....	25
Alkali Silica Reactivity Study .....	5
Sec. 373 Reimbursement by Civil Air Carriers for Johnston Atoll Support .....	
Sec. 1041 Inst. for Defense Computer Sec. & Info. Protection ....	
Sec. 2831 Land Conveyance, Price Support Center, Granite City, IL .....	10
Sec. 2832 Land Conveyance Hay Army Res. Center, Pittsburgh, PA .....	
Sec. 2833 Land Conveyance, Steele Army Res. Center, Pittsburgh, PA .....	
Sec. 2834 Land Conveyance Fort Lawton, WA .....	
Sec. 2835 Land Conveyance Vancouver Barracks, WA .....	
Sec. 2851 Land Conveyance MCAS Miramar, CA .....	
Sec. 2852 Land Conveyance, Defense Fuel Supply Point, Casco Bay, ME .....	
Sec. 2853 Land Conveyance Former NTC Bainbridge, Cecil County, MD .....	
Sec. 2854 Land Conveyance Naval Computer & Telecomm. Station, Cutler, ME .....	
Sec. 2871 Land Conveyance, Army & Air Force Exchange, Farmers Branch, TX .....	
AMENDMENTS	
Amdt. 3219 To modify authority to carry out a fiscal year 1990 military construction project at Portsmouth Naval Hospital, VA .....	8.5
Amdt. 3235 To authorize a land conveyance, Ft. Riley, KS .....	
Amdt. 3242 To modify authority for use of certain Navy property by the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, CA .....	
Amdt. 3383 To provide with an offset, \$5 million for R,D,T & E Defense wide for strategic environment Research & Development Program for technologies for detection & transport of pollutants from live-fire activities .....	5

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT (S. 2549) FOR FY2001  
ADD-ONS, INCREASES AND EARMARKS—Continued

	Dollars (in mil- lions)
Amdt. 3385 To set aside for weatherproofing facilities at Keesler Air Force Base, MS, \$2.8 million of amount authorized to be appropriated for USAF operation & maintenance ...	2.8
Amdt. 3389 To treat as veterans individuals who served in the Alaska Territorial Guard during W.W.II .....	
Amdt. 3400 To authorize a land conveyance, former National Ground Intelligence Center, Charlottesville, VA .....	
Amdt. 3401 To authorize a land conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Winona, MN .....	
Amdt. 3404 To authorize acceptance and use of gifts from Air Force Museum Foundation for the construction of a third building for the Museum at Wright-Patterson USAF Base, OH .....	
Amdt. 3407 To permit the lease of the Naval Computer Telecomm. Center, Cutler, ME, pending its conveyance .....	
Amdt. 3408 To modify the authorized conveyance of certain land at Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD .....	
Amdt. 3415 To provide for the development of a USMC Heritage Center at Marine Corps Base, Quantico, VA .....	
Amdt. 3423 To authorize SeNav to convey to the city of Jacksonville N.C., certain land for the purpose of permitting the development of a bike/green way trail .....	
Amdt. 3424 To authorize, with an offset, \$1.45 million for a contribution by the Air National Guard, the construction of a new airport tower at Cheyenne Airport, WY .....	30
Amdt. 3460 P-3/H-1/SH-60R Gun Modifications .....	30
Amdt. 3462 CIWS MOOS .....	
Amdt. 3465 Land Conveyance, Los Angeles AFB .....	
Amdt. 3466 Procurement of AV-8B aircraft .....	92
Amdt. 3467 Information Technology Center, LA .....	5
Amdt. 3468 USMC Trucks, tilting brackets and mobile electronic warfare support system .....	10
Amdt. 3477 Joint Technology Information Center Initiative .....	20
Amdt. 3481 Tethered Aerostat Radar System Sites .....	33
Amdt. 3482 Special Warfare Boat Integrated Bridge Systems .....	7
Amdt. 3483 R,D,T & E for Explosive Demilitarization Technology .....	5
Amdt. 3488 Procurement of AGM-65 Maverick missiles .....	2.1
Amdt. 3489 Procurement of Rapid Intravenous Infusion Pumps .....	6
Amdt. 3490 Training Range Upgrades, Fort Knox, KY .....	4
Amdt. 3490 (cont.) Overhaul of MK-45 5 inch guns .....	12
Amdt. 3770 National Labs Partnership Improvements .....	10
Amdt. 3801 National Energy Technology Lab, Fossil Energy R&D .....	4
Amdt. 3802 Florida Restoration Grant .....	2
Amdt. 3812 Indian Health Care for Diabetes .....	7.372
Amdt. 3807 Salmon restoration and conservation in Maine .....	5
Amdt. 3795 Forest System Land Review Committee .....	1
Total = \$1,981,522,000.00	

## SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my serious disappointment with the Fiscal Year 2001 Department of Defense Authorization bill, which passed the Senate earlier this week. I opposed a number of provisions in the bill, including language to restructure and rename the School of the Americas. It is this issue which I would like to address today.

Mr. President, it is clear that the Department of Defense recognizes there are serious problems with the School of the Americas, otherwise they would not have gone to the trouble of proposing to repackaging it. But make no mistake, that is all that has happened. While the name may not remain the same, the School of the Americas still exists.

Mr. President, I think a little history is in order here. The School of the Americas was founded in 1946, originally in the U.S.-controlled Panama Canal Zone. At that time, it was known as the Latin American Center-Ground Division. In 1963, the facility was renamed the School of the Americas, and in 1984, in compliance with the Panama Canal Treaty, the school was moved to Fort Benning, Georgia as part of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

SOA was charged with the mission of developing and conducting instruction

for the armed forces of Latin America. Unfortunately, what SOA has produced are some of the most notorious dictators and human rights abusers from Latin America including El Salvador death squad leader Roberto D'Abuissou, Panamanian dictator and drug dealer Manuel Noriega, Argentinian dictators Leopold Galtieri and Roberto Viola, and Peruvian dictator Juan Velasco Alvarado.

Mr. President, the list continues. SOA alumni include 48 of the 69 Salvadoran military members cited in the U.N. Truth Commission's report on El Salvador for involvement in human rights violations, including 19 of 27 military members implicated in the 1989 murder of six Jesuit priests.

SOA alumni reportedly also include more than 100 Colombian military officers alleged to be responsible for human rights violations, and several Peruvian military officers linked to the July 1992 killings of nine students and a professor from Peru's La Cantutu University.

SOA alumni include several Honduran officers linked to a clandestine military force known as Battalion 316 responsible for disappearances in the early 1980s.

And, SOA graduates have led military coups and are responsible for massacres of hundreds of people, including the Uraba massacre in Colombia, the El Mozote massacre of 900 civilians in El Salvador, the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero, the torture and murder of a UN worker, and hundreds of other human rights abuses.

Mr. President, it is not merely coincidence that SOA has such an egregious list of alumni. In September, 1996, the Department of Defense made available excerpts from seven Spanish-language training manuals used at SOA and it was revealed that those manuals included instruction in extortion, execution, and torture techniques that the Pentagon conceded were "clearly objectionable and possibly illegal."

Even today, the SOA legacy lives on. Just this past January, another SOA graduate, Guatemala Col. Byron Disrael Lima Estrada, was arrested for his involvement in the death of Guatemalan Bishop Juan Jose Gerardi in 1998. As CRS noted, Bishop Gerardi was murdered in April of 1998 just two days after he released a report accusing the Guatemalan military for most of the human rights abuses committed during the country's conflict.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, while the Department of Defense will ostensibly close the School of the Americas, it is producing a clone in its place. The Department of Defense Authorization bill establishes the Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training—an institution that appears in every way to be nothing more than a repackaged School of the Americas.

To my knowledge, nothing has been done to ensure that a thorough evaluation of SOA is conducted before this new entity is operational. As SOA Watch has noted, there appears to be no critical assessment of the training, procedures, performance or consequences of the SOA training program this new entity copies.

I regret the Pentagon has not taken more meaningful steps to address the horrifying legacy of SOA. I support closing SOA permanently, not merely changing its name.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of legislation introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) that would terminate this program.

But, Mr. President, even if there were any justification for continuing some portion of the School of the Americas, it should come only after a truly serious and independent review is made of the purpose, mission, curricula, administrative structure, and student selection of the new entity.

Given the bloody heritage of SOA, the very least we owe the people of Latin America and the innocent who have been killed is such a review. Unfortunately, that is not what will happen.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I am committed to promoting human rights throughout the world. While it may be appropriate for the United States military to train its colleagues from other nations, it is inexcusable that this training should take place at an institution with a reputation far beyond salvage. In my view, our government cannot continue to support the existence of a school or a simple repackaging of that school which has so many murderers among its alumni.

Mr. President, I will be watching this new institution very closely, and so, I have no doubt, will many of my constituents. My concerns about accountability and transparency have not been sufficiently addressed, and I will continue to raise this issue until I am satisfied that the U.S. Government has finally and firmly brought an end to the shameful legacy of the School of Americas.

#### CHINA AND NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, 3 years ago I came to the Senate floor to talk about China and how the United States can best achieve its national interests in the Far East.

I spoke then on the eve of two summits which went a long way toward putting the U.S.-China relationship on a firmer foundation. I called for a patient, principled engagement strategy designed to win greater Chinese compliance with international norms in the areas of human rights, non-proliferation, and trade.

Three years later, there has been some progress, but also some setbacks.

U.S.-China relations remain dogged by uncertainties—each side harbors doubts about the other's intentions, doubts reinforced by allegations of Chinese espionage and the tragic mistaken U.S. bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. China's fear of how we might exploit our position as the world's only superpower is matched by our concerns over China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and its intimidation tactics against Taiwan. China's leaders decry U.S. "hegemony" and "interference in their internal affairs." We worry about whether the Dragon will breathe fire at its neighbors, or just blow smoke.

So today I rise at what I believe may be a pivotal moment which will determine our Nation's future in Asia not just for this year, or next year, but for 10 years, 20 years, and into the world my grandchildren will inherit.

Three decisions—on national missile defense, on invoking sweeping new unilateral sanctions on China, and on extending permanent normal trade relations to China—will help shape U.S. strategic doctrine and irrevocably alter the security landscape in East Asia for decades to come. They are decisions which must be made in the context of revolutionary changes underway on the Korean Peninsula and an awakening China which wants to play in major leagues, but is not sure it wants to abide by all the rules of the game.

Today I wish to address the first of these three major decisions—national missile defense—as it relates to China and recent developments on the Korean peninsula.

Mr. President, I rise with optimism—my mother calls me a "congenital optimist." Not the optimism of a Phillies fan—a blind, fervent optimism born each spring, matured each summer, and dashed against the rocks by fall. No, I speak with the confidence which flows from the enormous capacity and good will of the American people. I am optimistic because we now enjoy an unprecedented opportunity to shape the future in ways which will enhance our national security and preserve our prosperity.

I reject the path of unrelieved pessimism and lack of common sense which, to me, underlies much of the thinking of those who believe China must be an enemy of the United States, and that North Korea can neither be deterred nor persuaded to abandon its pursuit of a nuclear missile capability.

I reject the pessimism which says that American idealism and the dynamism of American markets are somehow incapable of handling the opportunities which will be ours as China joins the World Trade Organization and opens its markets to the world.

But my optimism is informed by realism.

Let me put it bluntly: China does not believe that National Missile Defense is oriented against North Korea. According to those who justify a limited national missile defense on the basis of the North Korean threat, North Korea is ruled by a nutcase who by 2005 will be in position to launch an ICBM with weapons of mass destruction against the United States, and will do so without giving one thought to the consequences.

Who can blame China for questioning this rationale for a national missile defense? I question it myself.

The notion that North Korea's leader Kim Jong-il is going to wake up one morning and decide to attack the United States with long-range missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction is absurd!

The notion that 5 or 10 long-range missiles would deter us from defending South Korea is equally bogus. Did the Soviet Union's ability to devastate the United States prevent us from defending Europe for a generation and West Berlin in 1961, even in the face of superior Warsaw Pact strength on the ground? No.

Did it stop us from forcing the removal of missiles from Cuba in 1963, or from supplying Afghan mujaheddin in their successful struggle against Soviet forces? No.

Has China's ability to deliver a nuclear strike against a dozen or more U.S. cities prevented us from defending Taiwan? No, again.

Moreover, in the wake of the first North-South Summit meeting ever, the prospects for peaceful reconciliation between North and South Korea are better today than they have been in my lifetime. I'm not saying that peace on the Korean Peninsula is a "done deal." Far from it. North Korea has not withdrawn its heavy artillery. North Korea has not abandoned its missile program. North Korea has not halted all of its support for international terrorist organizations. There is a tremendous amount of hard work to be done.

But look at the facts that relate to our decision on national missile defense.

The last time North Korea launched a missile, I remind my colleagues, was on August 31, 1998. On that day, a three stage Taepo-Dong missile flew over Japan. The third stage of the missile apparently failed to perform as the North Koreans had hoped, but the mere existence of the third stage surprised many of our experts and caused them to reassess the North's capabilities and to advance the date by which North Korea might develop an ICBM to 2005.

But since August 1998, North Korea has not launched a long-range missile. It recently extended indefinitely the test-launch moratorium it implemented 15 months ago. Negotiations